Approved For Release 2005/12/14: CIA-RDP91-00901R000600410040-6

ARTICLE APPEARED ON EACE 3 -B

WASHINGTON TIMES
1 April 1985

## SOCIETY / Betty Beale

FILE ONLY

If you've been tut-tutting over former CIA chief Stansfield Turner deserting his wife after 30 years for another woman, forget it. Adm.
Turner was a model husband to Pat—sweet, attentive and considerate. When they wanted to get away from Washington after his retirement, he said Pat had followed him all over the world, so the least he could do was let her decide where they'd live.

She did and they moved to Arizona several winters ago. Pat was a great help in his Navy career but

she was not as attentive to Stan personally as he was to her. Now she's taken up painting, is having her work exhibited in art shows and is loving it. And the admiral did not latch on to some young doll. He married his secretary, Ellie Gilbert, who's his contemporary. Friends of both Pat and Stan Turner approve.

\_Approved\_For-Release 2005/12/14 : CIA-RDP91-00901R000600410040-6

WASHINGTON TIMES 21 March 1985



HE RISING SAP... Jingle those bells, again. Admiral Stansfeld Turner, Jimmy Carter's CIAmeister, has quietly shed Patricia, his mate of 30 years. This weekend — smack after her divorce from Sgt. John Gilbert, USAF, sailed through — Stansfeld up and married Ellie Karin Gilbert, his secretary. Ear, of course, always cheers for Amour. But it worries, too. Didn't Big Bill Colby, that other ex-Superspook, shuck a spouse exactly that way last year, before his happy hitching with Sally Shelton? Is there some Funny Substance in the Langley waterworks? Watch out, Bill Casey. Everyone else, just watch.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR 19 March 1985

# INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

# US is beefing up its covert activities

By Peter Grier

Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor

Washington

N the late 1940s, the US Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) provided funding for guerrilla fighters in China, Albania, and the Ukraine section of the Soviet Union. These operations—among the first covert actions by the agency—were but minor annoyances to their communist targets.

Forty years and much experience later, and half a world away, the United States is involved in "covert" operation, this one highly controversial. The country in question is Nicaragua; the US allies are an estimated 7,000 to 12,000 contras fighting their country's ruling Sandinista regime.

As covert actions go, this is a modest affair. But intelligence experts say that since there is no national consensus on overall US policy in Central America, aid to the *contras* has raised old questions about when and where secret action is justified.

It has also focused attention on the capabilities of US intelligence agencies, which are rebuilding after the budget and staff cuts of the mid-1970s. Covert action, after all, represents only a small fraction of what US intelligence does. Today, there is much debate among experts about the quality of the major portion of US intelligence work — research and analysis.

"There have been some successes, and some significant improvement in the quality of US intelligence," says a former military intelligence officer. But this source adds that there is still a tendency for reports to be too bland.

The US has long been ambivalent about the means required to produce good intelligence.

There is something abo does not fit our image of This attitude was expre tary of State Henry Stir down an operation that grams on the theory t read each other's mail."

But the fact is the US the not-quite-gentleman vening in other nation following World War II, der the table to Christ

and moderate worker groups throughout Western Europe to help keep the region from turning to communism. Paramilitary teams of partisans were dropped behind the Iron Curtain.

In the '50s, US envoy Kermit Roosevelt and a suitcase of money helped topple Iranian Prime Minister Mohammad Mossadeq, restoring the more pro-Western Shah Muhammad Reza Pahlavi to his throne. A somewhat gaudier campaign in 1954, including covert ra-

dio broadcasts and US-supplied warplanes, deposed Guatemalan head of state Jacobo Arbenz Guzmán (who had expropriated US corporate property).

Then came the Bay of Pigs. The US-backed partisan invasion of Fidel Castro's Cuba in 1961 was a military and propaganda flop.

By the mid 1970s, these and other operations had come back to haunt the CIA. A pair of congressional committees, angered by what they perceived as CIA abuse of power, proposed a number of reforms, most aimed at tightening control over the agency.

These committees considered a blanket ban on covert action. They backed off, however, after deciding the US did need a foreign policy tool in between mere speech and sending in the Marines. "We decided there were circumstances where you wanted to do it," says an academic source who was a staffer on one of the panels.

But the CIA, branded a "rogue elephant" by the public investigations, was not eager to rush

back into undercover actions. When President Carter took office in 1977, he inherited "zero" covert actions, according to his director of Central Intelligence, Adm. Stansfield Turner.

President Carter and Admiral Turner eased the CIA back into secret operations. This process has continued under the Reagan administration and its agency director, William Casey. By most accounts, Mr. Casey is a director preoccupied with covert action. Under his direction the CIA proposed (but did not get) such an action against the small South American country of Suriname, intelligence sources say.

The largest "covert" operation currently being run by the US ("It is a little bizarre to be debating covert action in public," says former CIA director William Colby) is probably its

### Approved For Release 2005/12/14: CIA-RDP91-00901R000600410040-6

ARTISLE APPEARED
ON PAGE 4

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR 15 February 1985

## **TO OUR READERS**

PEACE 2010

A CONTEST

The Peace 2010 ad disappeared from the pages of The Christian Science Monitor the last week in December. Since then, the senior editors of the paper have been busy reading the more than 1,000 entries received — plus 200 entries from those 18 years of age and younger.

The response to our invitation to write a scenario for peace in terms of looking back on the next 25 years was impressive. Most of the essays approached the maximum length of 3,000 words and represented thousands of hours of thought and writing.

The letters accompanying many of them were full of the sense of excitement and gratitude at being challenged to think specifically about the peace process. Along with publishing the three winning essays early in April, we intend to share some of the thoughts the writers had on the contest itself.

Essays emphasized different parts of the peace process. Some began with the military or economic considerations that might begin to move the United States and the Soviet Union off dead center in their relationship with each other. Some saw a strengthening of world organization. Others included a limited nuclear exchange or equally momentous event which changed the thinking of the superpowers and galvanized public action. Many were from

members of peace groups, and articulated a strategy by which some of today's action groups eventually change the outlook.

Another group could be called "change of consciousness" essays, in which significant numbers of people began to change the manner in which they viewed the world's problems to one more inclusive of mankind.

We have looked for realism in selecting the better essays. But what constitutes realism is not only what is based on military power or diplomatic skill; many essays have had a convincing scenario in which the paradigm through which events are viewed is changed.

From all these approaches to peace, we have now selected approximately 50 essays. These are being reviewed by our four outside judges, who will meet in Boston in mid-March to determine the three winners.

To judge this final group, we asked for assistance from a distinguished panel of world citizens: Kurt Waldheim, former secretary-general of the United Nations; Curt Gasteyger, director of the Program for International Studies in Geneva; Lincoln Bloomfield, professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a former member of the National Security Council; and Stansfield Turner, former director of the Central Intelligence Agency and a former NATO

commander. The varied disciplines, professional experience, and national outlook represented by this group ensure that a global perspective will be represented in the judging.

Who wrote to us? Members of large law firms; political figures; novelists; career people in international organizations; members of conflict resolution groups; academics; doctors and other professional people. Most of all, people who did not even hint who they are, other than that they were concerned enough to think through some of the steps that must happen if we are all to enjoy a more peaceful world. One hundred twenty-three of the entries came from 30 foreign countries; 30 of them were written in German, French, or Spanish.

The editors thank every person who wrote us regarding the contest. The thought that has gone into these essays is itself a constructive force for peace and will forward the peace process. One entrant said that writing his essay was the best Christmas present he had last year.

The seriousness of the response from our readers was also a kind of present for us; it indicated the deep mutual relationship we know exists between this newspaper and its readers. Thank you.

Richard A. Nenneman, managing editor